



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/342,408	06/28/1999	PING-WEN ONG	12	6490

7590 01/14/2003

RYAN MASON & LEWIS, LLP  
1300 POST ROAD, SUITE 205  
FAIRFIELD,, CT 06430

EXAMINER

HUYNH, THU V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/342,408

Applicant(s)

ONG, PING-WEN

Examiner

Thu V Huynh

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed on 10/31/2002 of application filed on 06/28/1999.
2. Claims 1-25 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 13 are independent claims.
3. Claims 3, 4, 15 and 16 are amended.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

(b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. **Claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-25 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman et al., US 6,006,227 as supplied by the Applicants in IDS filed on 10/09/2001 in view of Bohannon et al., US 6,125,371 filed 08/1997.**

**Regarding independent claim 1, Freeman teaches the steps of:**

- receiving a request for an electronic document, said request including a variable time-stamp (Freeman, col.3, lines 15-29, receiving a request including chronological indicator time stamp from a user); and

Art Unit: 2178

- identifying said electronic document corresponding to said variable time-stamp  
(Freeman, col.4 lines 43-46).

Freeman does not explicitly disclose identifying versions of said electronic document corresponding to said variable time stamp, but his chronological indicators are in fact timestamp used to identify the associated electronic documents.

Bohannon teaches the implementation of versioning and the use of time stamp to identify the different versions of the document (Bohannon, col.5 lines 36-41)

It would have been obvious for a person of skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combined Freeman and Bohannon to implement the use of time stamps and versioning to manage a history of documents creation and update since this will provide the capability to identify the different versions of the documents.

**Regarding dependent claim 2**, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches wherein an address identifying said electronic document includes said time-stamp (Freeman, col.3, lines 25-30 and col.13, lines 20-45).

**Regarding dependent claim 3**, which is dependent on claim 2, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 2 as explained above. Freeman teaches wherein said address is a Uniform Resource Locator (“URL”) (Freeman, col.13, lines 20-45, web address).

Art Unit: 2178

**Regarding dependent claim 5**, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches wherein said request is specified using a browser (Freeman, col.13, lines 20-35, web address from a web browser).

**Regarding dependent claim 6**, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches wherein said request includes a relative time stamp (Freeman, col.3, lines 19-25, chronological indicators including past, present, and future times).

**Regarding dependent claim 7**, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman does not explicitly disclose wherein said variable time-stamp includes a wildcard character.

However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included the use of wild cards such in a search request since it was well known that wild cards are useful for indicating unknown component in a search.

**Regarding dependent claim 8**, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches wherein said variable time-stamp includes a date range (Freeman, col.7 lines 39-59).

Art Unit: 2178

**Regarding dependent claim 9**, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches displaying a list of the web resources that satisfy said variable time stamp (Freeman, figure 1 and col.13 lines 10-26).

**Regarding dependent claim 10**, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches wherein said variable time-stamp can be utilized to identify a version of said electronic document having an unknown time (Freeman, col.3 lines 19-21 and col.4 lines 62-67).

**Regarding dependent claim 11**, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches the step of displaying a list of said documents satisfying said variable time stamp (Freeman, figure 1). However, Freeman does not disclose the step of displaying a list of said versions satisfying said variable time stamp.

Bohannon teaches the step of maintaining a version list of entry between various versions of a document.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bohannon and Freeman to implement the step of displaying a list of said versions satisfying said variable time stamp since this would have provided the user with information concerning the different versions of a document.

**Regarding dependent claim 12**, which is dependent on claim 1, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 1 as explained above. Freeman teaches the step of displaying list

Art Unit: 2178

of documents in an order specified by a user (Freeman, figure 1). However, Freeman does not explicitly disclose the step of displaying said list of links in an order specified by a user.

Bohannon teaches the step of maintaining a version list of entry and links between various versions of a document.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bohannon and Freeman to implement the step of displaying said list of links in an order specified by a user since this would have provided the user with information concerning the links between different versions of a document.

**Regarding independent claim 13**, claim 13 is for a computer system performing the method of claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale. Freeman does not explicitly state that the system have a memory for storing said multiple version of said electronic document in an archive of electronic documents; and a processor operatively coupled to said memory, said processor configured to performing method claim 1. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have recognized that Freeman and Bohannon' system must have a memory and a processor to implement the method as explained in claim 1, since the system is computer system and used on the web.

**Claims 14-15 and 17-24** are for a computer system performing the method of claims 2-3 and 5-12, respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2178

**Claim 25** is for an article of manufacture comprising computer readable medium performing the method of claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

6. **Claims 4 and 16 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeman in view of Bohannon as applied to claim 3 above and further in view of Kisor et al., US 5,978,847 filed 12/1996.**

**Regarding dependent claim 4**, which is dependent on claim 3, Freeman and Bohannon teach the limitations of claim 3 as explained above. Freeman does not explicitly disclose wherein said Uniform Resource Locator ("URL") has an associated request header for indicating said variable time stamp.

Kisor discloses that the URL has an associated request header for indicating said time stamp (Kisor, col.3, line 50-59, and col.7, line 21-25).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Kisor and Freeman to allow the client to retrieve desired Web information based on the time stamp, since Freeman would have provided a time stamp to determine the Web page's creation time.

**Claim 16** is for a computer system performing the method of claim 4, and is rejected under the same rationale

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10/31/2002 have been fully considered but they are not



Art Unit: 2178

persuasive.

Applicants argue that Freeman and Bohannon do not show a time-stamp in a user document request, and that the combination of Freeman and Bohannon teaches away from the applicants' invention.

This is not persuasive. Freeman disclosure of his find operation using chronological expression such as "my last letter to Schwart", "my next appointment", etc. (Freeman, col.4 line 64-67) inherently implies there is a timestamp in the user's request for document retrievals. Another specific feature in Freeman's that shows the user's selection of time-stamps while requesting for document retrievals is on Fig.1 box 20 and discussed in col.6 line 32-36 (Freeman). Applicants' discussion about specific file name requirements is not to be found in the claims and thus will not be considered. Nevertheless, Freeman's implementation does discuss about user's capability to select specific name for his documents if needed. An ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made was certainly able to modified Freeman's implementation to include other features facilitating the document retrieval processes based on time-stamps associated in the requests for these documents.

Since Freeman does not explicitly disclose the versioning process, Bohannon's teachings are used for his versioning and the use of timestamp to identify the different versions of the document (Bohannon, col.5 lines 36-41). An ordinary skilled in the art would have modified and combined Bohannon's into Freeman's since they both taught steps of how to use timestamps in saving, deleting, identifying and retrieving data and documents. In other words, the combination of Freeman and Bohannon would have helped in managing multiple versions of document by using time-stamps.

Art Unit: 2178

It would have been therefore obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Freeman and Bohannon to provide users with a system to manage documents based on timestamp associated with these documents, besides other things, since this would have helped greatly in the documents archival (Freeman, col.1 line 60 to col.2 line 5).

Applicants argue that Kisor does not suggest a request for an electronic document including a variable time-stamp.

This is not persuasive. Kisor's reference is used to further illustrate a URL that has an associated request header for indicating a timestamp, Kisor's teaching discloses that the request field in a GET specifies to the server to retrieve whatever information is identified the request header field (Kisor, col.7 line 21-25). Kisor further discloses that a timestamp specifier is often used in a typical HTTP header to specify the last modified date (Kisor, col.3 line 50-59). All these imply the use of a timestamp specifier in a user request header is available and readily to be used.

It would have been therefore obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Kisor into Freeman and Bohannon to allow users to retrieve desired Web information based on the time stamp, since Freeman would have provided a time-stamp to determine the Web page's creation time.

### *Conclusion*

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

Art Unit: 2178

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thu v Huynh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R Herndon can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications, and (703) 746-7240 for Non-Official/Draft.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9000.

TVH  
January 12, 2003

  
HEATHER R. HERNDON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100